



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

III.—ΣΧΗΜΑ ΠΙΝΔΑΡΙΚΟΝ.

The present investigation is thought to be necessary, owing to the unscientific treatment which the σχῆμα Πινδαρικόν has received in many grammars and editions. The name has been used as a convenient label for more than 50 passages—examples of concord, regular and irregular, of various kinds. Whether it be a case of an old plural form of a verb mistaken for a singular, or an impersonal verb or singular copulative verb joined with a plural complement, or a change of construction to a simpler form, we get grammars old and new, and editions up to the last four years, using the name σχῆμα Πινδαρικόν as if it were an explanation, and quoting as parallels cases that have been long cleared up or cases that show a totally distinct nature. In the following lists, for completeness, I have brought forward many passages which have been already properly explained, as well as many which have not, because scholars such as Sandys, Tyrrell, Campbell and Abbott have helped in recent years to perpetuate unscientific explanations. For example, the following bald comment is what is usually found in editions both German and English (from a recent Germ. edition of Aeschines in Ctesiph. §185): 'σχῆμα Πινδαρικών: das Verbum geht in den meisten Fällen dem Subjekt voran.' This dictum will be seen to apply to no more than one-quarter of the examples usually grouped under this head. Again, the name should be given up when it is seen that *very* few of the examples cited are to be found in Pindar, and the passages cited from Pindar are found to be of very diverse character, admitting various explanations. But it is still more important that the phrases 'this idiom,' 'this syntactical figure,' should be no longer applied without discrimination to the various passages.

A convenient division of the passages treated is this: I. Those in which points of accident have to be considered; and II. Those which turn on points of syntax.

I. The first set of examples which have long been quoted by grammars as containing a singular verb with a plural subject shows us what is nothing but an old plural verb-form—ῆν; v.

Hesiod, Theog. 321, 825, 146; Simonides 165 [225]; Inscription of 475 B. C. on a Hermes, in Aeschines in Ctesiph. 185; Sophocles, Trach. 520; Eur. Ion 1146; Epicharmus 82, 52 (Ahrens 28) in Athenaeus VII 288b, Epicharmus 30, 31, 38, 49 in Athenaeus 307c; and Aristoph. Lysistr. 1260—a total of 13 examples, of which the last 7 are distinctly Doric Greek.

When Ahrens had shown in 1843 (II 326) that $\eta\nu$ in some of the above examples was a 3d plural form, we should not have expected to find these passages quoted as often as they have been in support of supposed cases of the $\sigma\chi\eta\mu\alpha$ Πινδαρικόν to be considered later. $\eta\nu$ is the natural contraction of the original Greek form $\eta\alpha\nu$ (Meyer) or $\epsilon\alpha\nu$ (Morph. Unters. IV, p. 293) from the I. E. e-s- $\eta\tilde{t}$, corresponding to the Skr. $\acute{a}san$, Boeotian $\pi\alpha\rho\text{-}\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu$. The revived form $\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$ does not occur in Hesiod (for Op. 111 is rejected on other grounds), Pindar and Theocritus; hence the only two examples of it in Homer are due to late rewriting of the lines Il. 3, 15 and Od. 1, 27. The rareness of $\epsilon\sigma\alpha\nu$ (twice in Il., once in Od.) also leads us to conclude that the popular repetition of Homer, and to some extent of other poets, has weeded out the instances of $\eta\nu$ for the 3d pers. plur. Possibly such a correction has taken place in such passages of Homer and Hesiod as Hes. Scut. Her. 246, where $\eta\nu$ suits as well as $\epsilon\sigma\alpha\nu$.

In Hes. Theog. 146, an example hitherto unnoticed, we get rid of the difficulty of the F by reading $\eta\nu$ $\epsilon\pi\acute{\iota}$ $F\acute{\epsilon}\rho\gamma\omicron\iota\varsigma$ instead of $\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$ $\epsilon\pi\acute{\iota}$ $\epsilon\rho\gamma\omicron\iota\varsigma$, if the line be old.

In Soph. Trachin. 520 the simplest explanation is that Sophocles was consciously using an archaic or Doric form, perhaps partly for artistic reasons, for $\eta\nu$ is twice used before and once afterwards at the beginning of each clause.

In Eur. Ion 1146, $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta\nu$ δ' $\acute{\iota}\phi\alpha\nu\tau\alpha\iota$ $\gamma\rho\acute{\alpha}\mu\mu\alpha\sigma\iota\nu$ $\tau\omicron\iota\alpha\acute{\iota}\delta'$ $\acute{\iota}\phi\alpha\acute{\iota}$, we are compelled either to believe that Eur. like Sophocles chose to use what he knew to be an old plural form (for we cannot suppose him to have been ignorant of the use of $\eta\nu$ in Doric or in Hesiod) or resort to the explanation that a first thought such as $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta\nu$ δ' $\acute{\iota}\phi\alpha\nu\tau\grave{\alpha}$ $\gamma\rho\acute{\alpha}\mu\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$ was changed and amplified, and that $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta\nu$ was kept for metrical reasons.

In Lucian, Amores, p. 410, $\eta\nu$ δ' $\acute{\iota}\pi\omicron$ $\tau\alpha\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\nu$ $\pi\alpha\lambda\iota\nu\sigma\kappa\acute{\iota}\omicron\iota\varsigma$ $\acute{\iota}\lambda\alpha\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ $\acute{\iota}\lambda\alpha\rho\alpha\acute{\iota}$ $\kappa\lambda\acute{\iota}\sigma\iota\alpha\iota$ $\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma$ $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\sigma\tau\acute{\iota}\alpha\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ $\theta\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\nu$, $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ $\acute{\alpha}$ $\tau\hat{\omega}\nu$ $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ $\acute{\alpha}\sigma\tau\iota\kappa\hat{\omega}\nu$ $\sigma\pi\alpha\nu\acute{\iota}\omega\varsigma$ $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\phi\acute{o}\iota\tau\omega\nu$ $\tau\iota\nu\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma$, not much doubt has been cast on the reading $\eta\nu$; all MSS have $\acute{\alpha}$; the margin of one has $\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$. Unless this be considered a conscious imitation of previous authors on the part of either Lucian or his

copyist, each of which hypotheses is difficult to believe, it must be a mere slip. In the former case such passages as those mentioned above, Hes. Theog. 321, 825, Soph. Trach. 520, would be the authorities for the usage of singular verb with a following plural noun. It seems impossible to look on $\eta\nu = \etaσαν$ as a survival in popular speech through the κοινή times.

Analogous to the above in one respect are the foll. passages: Eur. Hipp. 1255: αἰαί· κέκρανται συμφοραὶ νέων κακῶν. Pind. Pyth. 9, 33 [57]: φόβῳ δ' οὐ κεχείμανται φρένες. Xen. R. Equ. 5, 5: κέκλινται τρίχες. Dem. 22, §66 and 24, §173 (p. 754): πολλῶν ῥητόρων οἱ παρὰ τοῦτοις κέκρυνται. In the first two passages emendations have been usually adopted in the face of complete agreement of the MSS. But is it not satisfactory to suppose that like the early grammarians and copyists, who have not varied the text in these cases, the authors used κέκρανται and κεχείμανται as third plural forms on the analogy of λελυται, μέμνηται, etc.? It is probable that there were many such usages in early colloquial Greek. Another wrongly supposed singular verb-form is seen in (Hom.) Hymns, Ceres 280, ξανθαὶ δὲ κόμαι κατενήνοθεν ὦμους, where no doubt the writer took the form as a plural from a similarity to such forms as ἀνεθεν διέκριθεν ἀπέσσυθεν; though an examination of the passages where ἐπενήνοθεν and κατενήνοθεν are used in Homer and Hesiod shows that none of them could be misread as having -ενήνοθεν as a plural form.

Aeschylus, Persae 49, is a case for restoration of original reading: στεῦνται δ' ἱεροῦ Τρώλου πελάται | ζύγον ἀμφιβαλεῖν δοῦλιον Ἑλλάδι. Here στεῦνται was the original—most MSS give it—and the copyists, like the Schol., who calls it an example of the σχ. Πινδ., changed it to στεύται, knowing that only that 3d pers. sing. form is found in Homer. But such an extension of Homeric usage is perfectly natural to all post-Homeric writers. Paley says, 'in this case, as the metre equally admits στεῦνται, the singular could not have proceeded from an emendator.' Surely no emendation is more to be expected from pedantic copyists or grammarians.

Four passages with πάρα have been cited as examples: Eur. Med. 441: σοὶ δ' οὔτε πατὴρ δόμοι . . . πάρα. Aesch. Eumen. 31: κεί παρ' Ἑλλήνων τινές. Ar. Ach. 862: ὑμεῖς δ' ὅσοι Θείβαθεν αὐληταὶ πάρα. Ar. Ach. 1091: αἱ πόρναι πάρα. In these commentators have persistently denied that πάρα can represent πάρεσι, but why it cannot no one has yet explained. They must be all following some

original who pointed out that *πάρα* with plural subjects is unusual, and then chose to call it impossible. Surely it was natural for Greeks to use it when required, as they used *ἐνι* for *ἐνεισιν* as well as for *ἐνεσσι*; see *Odyss.* 21, 288, *ἐνι τοι φρένες οὐδ' ἤβαιαί.*

Archimedes, de *Helic. Prop.* XXIV, p. 244, l. 35 (ed. Torelli), *καὶ ἀναγέγραπται ἀπὸ πασῶν ὁμοῖοι τομέες*, can certainly not be classed as a conscious mannerism or imitation of previous authors. Is it not a Doric relic of an old 3d plur. form, corresponding to *γεγραψάται* on the *Tab. Heracl.* 1, 121, perhaps coming in here from popular speech? It is noteworthy that 44 lines later we have *καὶ ἀναγεγράφονται ἀπὸ πασῶν ὁμοῖοι τομέες*, where the original 3d plur. has been assimilated to the present tense 3d plur. formation; but our copyist's trustworthiness cannot be relied on.

Two more passages of Hesiod need a little explanation: *Scut.* 245: *ἄνδρες δ', οἱ πρεσβῆες ἔσαν, γῆρας τε μέμαρπεν*, has been cited as an example by some who have taken *μέμαρπεν* as singular for plural, and translate as Gaisford—'who had reached old age.' No parallel to such a sense of *μάρπτω* has been found. The phrase must have been modelled on *Odyss.* 24, 390, *ἐπεὶ κατὰ γῆρας ἔμαρψεν*, or a similar phrase, and the clause is an additional paratactic clause: 'and old age seized on them.' Those who take the reading *μέμαρπον*, which is not so good, can say in defence that the author modelled it on the line from the *Odyssey* above, which he misread as 'seized on old age.' In *Hes. Theog.* 790, *ρέει . . . Ὠκεανοῖο κέρας . . . ἐννέα μιν . . . εἰλιγμένους εἰς ἅλα πίπτει*, discarding Paley's 'simpler meaning,' we see that *ἐννέα (μοῖραι)* is in apposition to *Ὠκεανός* with which *εἰλιγμένους* agrees.

To Pindar are attributed 8 examples, in most of which the best authorities have changed the old reading, and other methods of clearing up the difficulty are possible. In *Olymp.* XI (X) 6 all MSS but one give:

μελιγάρυες ὕμνοι
ὑστέρων ἀρχαὶ λόγων
τέλλεται καὶ πιστὸν ὄρκιον μεγαλαῖς ἀρεταῖς.

A gives *ἀρχὰ*. Christ and Gildersleeve take the reading of A, 'and the example disappears.' It is not strange that *ἀρχαὶ* became the usual reading; a reciter or copyist would easily assimilate it to the neighboring plural *ὕμνοι*. Others who accept *ἀρχαὶ* have suggested that *τέλλεται* is due to the thought of the coming singular *ὄρκιον*. With either of these legitimate explanations the example is disposed of.

In Pyth. X 71, ἐν δ' ἀγαθοῖσι κείται πατρῷαι κεδναὶ πολίων κυβερνάσιες, for κείται, the authority of most MSS is accepted by the grammarians—down to Thompson, 1883, but rejected by Christ (1882) and Gildersleeve (1885), who read κύνται. It is certainly better to accept κύνται. Or, to suggest another explanation, is κείται a relic of the old plural κέαται or κείαται, both of which occur in Homer?

A fragment of Pindar, IV 3, 16 (45, 16), is supposed to contain two examples. The best reading to take is Christ's:

τότε βάλλεται, τότ' ἐπ' ἀμβρόταν χθόν' ἐραταὶ
 ἴων φόβαι ῥόδα τε κόμαισι μίγνυνται,
 ἀχέιτ' ὀμφᾷ μελέων σὺν αὐλοῖς,
 ἀχέιτε Σεμέλαν ἐλικάμπυκα χοροί.

βάλλεται stands alone with its subject unexpressed, perhaps thought of as ἴα, and then the thought is amplified to ἴων φόβαι ῥόδα τε with a singular verb agreeing with its nearer subject ῥόδα, as is often found, v. Jebb on Soph. O. C. 7, 8. In 18, the return to the 2d person plural, ἀχέιτε, is not unnatural for Pindar or Greek, and ἀχέιτ' ὀμφᾷ is preferable to ἀχέιται ὀμφαί; both ἀχέιτε's satisfy the requirements of sense and rhythm; they have support from the reading of a Paris MS given by Schneidewin, οἰχνεῖτ' ὀμφᾷ.

Three more fragments of Pindar remain to be considered. In IV 6 (225) Christ reads:

κλῦθ' Ἀλαλά, πολέμου θύγατερ,
 ἐγγέων προοίμιον, ᾗ θύεται
 ἄνδρες ὕπερ πόλιος τὸν ἱρόθυτον θάνατον.

Kirchhoff reads αἰθύεται. With the former reading, we must suppose ἄνδρες corrupt, or else the composer used θύεται metri gratia. It is best, however, to punctuate after αἰθύεται, and take ἄνδρες as the subject to some verb in a subsequent line lost.

In 265 and 285 we find: ἰάχει βαρυφθεγκτᾶν ἀγέλαι λεόντων, and μελιρρόθων ἀνθέων ἐπεται πλόκαμοι. In the absence of the context we may be content to leave these lines in their obscurity; surely nothing ought to be built on such a poor basis as these two examples treasured up in the pages of an unscientific grammarian.

Finally, in Pindar, Pyth. IV 57, we have a passage that seems hopeless: ᾗ ῥα Μηδείας ἐπέων στίχες.

a). The Schol. takes ᾗ as equal to ἔφη and calls it σχῆμα Πινδαρικόν.

b). Some say ᾗ is the imperf. plur. of εἰμί here.

c). Böckh read αἱ ῥα, 'these (were) . . .'

d). Paley read ἦν (= ἔφασαν) plural of ἦ in Homer's ἦ ῥα καὶ . . .

e). Christ reads ἦ ῥα.

Gildersleeve says 'ἦ ῥα, the Homeric asseveration, well suited to the solemn oracular passage'; and says the copula ἐστί, εἰσί is rare in Pindar; but here the imperfect is wanted. Pindar only uses ἦ ῥα in two other passages: as P. 9, 38, where it introduces a question as in Homer, and P. 11, 38, where it introduces the first of two alternatives, as in Homer also. So we are entitled to say that these words at the close of a speech: "Verily the rows of words (oracular verses) of Medea," are strange and abrupt even for Pindar. We may doubt, if not finally reject, *a*, *b*, *c* and *d* of the above explanations; but it would perhaps be presumptuous to declare any reading final.

II. In the case of Herodot. 1, 26, ἔστι δὲ μετὰ τῆς τε παλαιῆς πόλιος ἢ τότε ἐπολιορκέετο καὶ τοῦ νηοῦ ἑπτὰ στάδιοι. and 7, 34, ἔστι δὲ ἑπτὰ στάδιοι ἐξ Ἀβύδου ἐς τὴν ἀπάντιον, the verb comes first, and with it at the same time in the writer's mind is present a general notion as the subject, not στάδιοι, which is the complement, but τὸ μῆκος or τὸ διάστημα. Cp. 2, 6, αὐτῆς δὲ τῆς Αἰγύπτου ἐστὶ μῆκος τὸ παρὰ θάλασσαν ἐξήκοντα σχοῖνοι. The fact that the place described in 7, 34 was commonly known as τὸ ἑπταστάδιον can have nothing to do with the use of the singular verb. In speaking a Greek might often use such a form of expression, and when written down, if it did occur to him that the singular sounded strange with the plural following, he would allow it to stand as being countenanced by popular usage, just as it sanctioned ἔστιν οἱ κ. τ. λ. Parallels in modern languages are plentiful: as 'it is twelve miles to . . .'; 'il y a cent mètres'; 'il est cent usages qui . . .'

As in Herod. 7, 34, so we find in Aristoph. Vespaie 58, ἡμῖν γὰρ οὐκ ἔστι . . . δούλω διααρριπτοῦντε, no case of a singular verb with plural subject, but there is to be supplied a subject to ἐστὶ like τὸ δράμα, δούλω being the complement. We have more examples of ἐστὶ followed by plural complements in Plato, Rep. 5, 463 A, Euthydemus 302 C, and Gorgias 500 D.

The above usages were as natural as any form of concord to Greeks who were used to ἔστιν οἱ, ἔστιν οὓς (cf. καὶ ξένους ἂν πολλοὺς εἰσενεγκεῖν, ἔστι δ' ἄς ἂν καὶ πόλεις, in Xenophon), and even ἔστιν ἐν οἷς, as Thuc. 5, 25; but we should note that εἰσὶν οἱ occurs in Thuc. 6, 10; and rarely ἦν οἱ for ἦσαν οἱ, as Xen. Anab. 1, 5, 7, ἦν τούτων τῶν σταθμῶν οὓς πάνν μακροὺς ἤλαυνεν.

To be contrasted with Herod. 7, 34 are certain passages such as Isocr. Panegyr. p. 543, Plato, Leg. 5, p. 732 E, and Hdt. 6, 112, 3, which show real examples of disagreement of verb and subject: the verb being attracted to agree with the complement because it stands nearer than—in fact before—the subject. In Plato, Rep. 8, 562 the order is different, but it is the same case of attraction.

The passage often quoted, Thuc. 3, 36, *προσξυνεβάλετο οὐκ ἐλάχιστον τῆς ὁρμῆς αἱ Πελοποννησίων νῆες ἐς Ἴωνίαν ἐκείνοις βοήθοι τολμήσασαι παρακινδυνεύσαι*, where Kühner and many editors have gone astray, is capable of easy explanation. There is a change of construction from the expected cumbrous form τὸ and the infin. into a simpler and more convenient form of expression, the noun plainly put with the participle. αἱ νῆες stands just as occisus Caesar is used for the English abstract notion 'the death of Caesar'; the difficulty lying in the English rather than in the Greek, which was not fettered by formulated rules which would prevent naturalness of expression. The chances of a second reading causing a change in the form of the sentence to avoid the apparent collocation of singular with plural would vary with the temperament of the author. For similar cases cp. Thuc. 4, 26, αἴτιον δ' ἦν οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι προειπόντες, and 8, 9, αἴτιον ἦν with a participle. From this author one more passage remains to be considered: 2, 3: ἀμάξας καθίστασαν ἴν' ἀντὶ τείχους ἦ. On this Matthiae actually said, 'the author had probably ἄρματα in his mind'; if Thucydides thought at all about a logical subject for ἦ, it would be τὸ σταύρωμα or ὁ φραγμὸς or the like.

One grammarian has said 'the ἐστὶ or γίγνεται always comes first.' Three passages showing a part of the verb γίγνομαι may here be taken:

Andoc. 1, 45: ἀφ' ὧν ἐμοὶ ξενίαὶ καὶ φιλότῃτες πρὸς πολλοὺς καὶ βασιλέας καὶ πόλεις καὶ ἄλλους ἰδίᾳ ξένους γεγνηται.

Plato, Sympos. 188 B: καὶ γὰρ πάχναι καὶ χάλαζαι καὶ ἐρυσίβαι ἐκ πλεονεξίας καὶ ἀκοσμίας περὶ ἄλληλα τῶν τοιούτων γίγνεται ἐρωτικῶν.

Plato, Rep. 363 A: ἵνα δοκοῦντι δικαίῳ εἶναι γίγνεται ἀπὸ τῆς δόξης ἀρχαί τε καὶ γάμοι καὶ ὅσα περ Γλαῦκων διήλθεν.

The simplest explanation of these three passages is to say that the use of the singular verb is a slip; the subjects being many, and the verb coming at a distance, the singular is used as if the whole of the names of things were taken as a neuter plural. This is satisfactory for the first two passages, where the verb comes

after the subjects ; but in the last of the three it is possible that when the verb γίγνηται was written, the subjects were thought of differently, perhaps in some neuter plural form, which was then changed into detail. With regard to the second passage, it should not be forgotten that Sauppe has ejected γίγνεται, and the whole sentence is only an amplification of the preceding, so that the two sentences have probably been tampered with.

So in Plato, Timaeus 45 A, σκέλη μὲν οὖν χεῖρές τε ταύτη καὶ διὰ ταῦτα προσέφην πᾶσιν, we must take χεῖρές τε (unless it be ejected as a later addition) as a later addition in thought ; or the thought of σκέλη outweighed the expected influence of the after-thought. Again, it is possible to consider the whole subject as practically the same as one concrete neuter plural. With the former explanation compare Il. 17, 386 and 23, 380, quoted later.

We next consider Eur. Bacch. 1350 : αἰαὶ δέδοκται, πρέσβυ, τλήμονες φυγαί. The verb δέδοκται generally is used impersonally, or with neuter pronouns. The construction with δέδοκται here is of similar nature with the construction in Hdt. 7, 34 (above), and in δέδοκται ἐμοὶ φυγεῖν the infinitive may be called appositional or explanatory of the idea contained in δέδοκται ; in the same way φυγαὶ stands here in apposition, and is not to be looked on as the subject. If any second thoughts arose in Euripides' mind on the form of the construction, he was debarred from using the plural δεδογμένοι εἰσίν. Apparently Euripides could not have written τλημόνως φυγεῖν : τλημόνως in the passages we know never means 'miserably,' but always 'patiently.' To suppose, as Kühner did, that δέδοκται = δέδοκνται, 'mit ausgefallenem ν,' is quite impossible.

Perhaps ῥάδιον δ' ἀπαλλαγαί, Med. 1375, helps to bear out the above remarks, and also Thuc. 3, 36 (above) ; but we can hardly class with them, as some have done, Phoen. 963, δῆλον οἷ γ' ἐμοὶ λόγοι.

It is impossible to believe that Euripides was ignorant of ἦν as a plural form when he wrote Ion 1146, or that he deliberately extended the usage of a singular verb with a plural subject, with the passages treated above, such as Hesiod, Theog. 321, 825, and Sophocles, Trach. 520 as justifications, or that he was aware of a condition that the singular verb must precede when so used. In Helen. 1358 :

μέγα τοι δύναται νεβρῶν
παμποῖκιλοι στολίδες,
κισσοῦ τε στεφθεῖσα χλόα
νάρθηκας εἰς ἱερούς . . .

we must explain by supposing that the first thought was different, perhaps was μέγα τοι δύναται χλόα, this being interrupted by an amplification νεβρῶν . . . στολίδες, which fitted into its place well metrically, and so δύναται was not changed for metrical reasons. The only possible alternative is to take δύναται as used in an impersonal way, and take στολίδες and χλόα as complements; thus the passage would be connected with those above with ἔστι, Hdt. 1, 26 and 7, 34. With the former explanation, however, we can compare the looseness of grammar due to a change of expression, seen in Plato, Theaet. 173 D: σπουδαὶ δ' ἔταιρειῶν . . . καὶ σύνοδοι καὶ δεῖπνα καὶ σὺν αὐλητρίσι κῶμοι-οὐδὲ ὄναρ πράττειν προσίσταται αὐτοῖς. The breaking off the sentence after κῶμοι is quite natural to the unstudied ease of Platonic dialogue; in English conversation the same interruption is quite common.

We may refer here to two passages in Homer containing similar inaccuracies of grammar; Il. 17, 386:

καμάτῳ δὲ καὶ ἰδρῶ . . .
γούνατα τε κνήμαί τε πόδες θ' ὑπένερθεν ἑκάστου
χείρες τ' ὀφθαλμοὶ τε παλάσσετο μαρναμένουσιν.

Il. 23, 380: πνοιῇ δ' Εὐμήλοιο μετάφρενον εὐρέε τ' ὤμω | θέρμετο. The verb in each case was taken by the writer as agreeing with the first subject; the later words being added as afterthoughts. It is possible too that the exigences of metre help to account for the singular, παλάσσοντο being inadmissible.

Again, it seems impossible to believe that Euripides deliberately joined a singular verb with a plural noun in Phoen. 349:

ἀνὰ δὲ Θηβαίαν | πόλιν ἐσιγάθη σᾶς ἔσοδοι νύμφας,

where the best MSS give εἴσοδοι, the next best εἴσοδον, and also one of the good copies; many have εἴσοδος, which Porson read. Taking ἔσοδος to be the original, we account for the change to the plural as being an early copyist's slip in the first instance, which was perpetuated by other copyists and grammarians ready to see an example of the supposed σχῆμα Πινδαρικόν; possibly the ι for σ was a mistake in connection with the ι of εἴσοδος, a marginal gloss. If we are not content to read ἔσοδος, as Dindorf and nearly all since Seidler have read, we must fall back on the somewhat weak explanation that the first thought was ἐσιγάθη ἡ σὴ νύμφη ἐσιούσα, which was changed, as being too prosy, to the plural ἔσοδοι νύμφας, rather than ἔσοδος, possibly to avoid the coming together of three

words ending in *ς*. In this case the passage would be classed with Thucyd. 3, 36 (above).

A difficult passage is seen in Hipponax 29 [12]:

δύ' ἡμέραι γυναικός ἐστιν ἥδιστα | ὅταν γαμῇ τις, κάκφ' ἔρη τεθνηκυῖαν.

All MSS have *ἐστιν* except one, which has *εἰσίν*; Gaisford, Bergk (1st ed. and 3d ed., 1883) read *εἰσίν*. There is no special reason why *ἔστιν* should have arisen if *εἰσίν* had been the author's word, unless all the MSS have one original, which have a copyist's slip, perpetuated by grammarians, glad to find support for their *σχῆμα Πινδαρικόν*. If this explanation be inadequate, it remains a mystery why popular recitation of the lines should not have altered the word; and if Hipponax really consciously put *ἐστι* after a plural subject, it is strange that it should never occur again in his writings or those of any other lyric poet. The better way out of the difficulty is to follow the best editors and read *εἰσιν*, rather than allow this passage to be put down as one of the irreducible minimum.

It will now have been seen how various is the nature of the examples set down as instances of the *σχῆμα Πινδαρικόν*. To draw a few conclusions: the case of *ἦν* with plural subject is perfectly clear. Many, too, of the passages quoted in Section I of this paper need no further remark; some of them have been mentioned for no intrinsic difficulty, but merely because they have so often been cited to bolster up other passages. If in one or two the explanations given are not fully satisfactory, they can at least be said to hold the field at present, with the consent of many authorities. Again, we may at once set aside, as needing no further mention in connection with this subject, all the numerous disjunctive examples (as Pindar, Pyth. 10, 41, *νόσοι δ' οὔτε γῆρας οὐλόμενον κέκραται*), which are only referred to here because they have been so frequently quoted, though well classed apart by Kühner. We may set aside, too, all such passages as Soph. O. C. 7, 8, *αἱ πάθαι με χῶ' χρόνος ξυνὼν μακρὸς διδάσκει*, where the singular verb agrees with the nearer of two subjects, a plural and a singular, on which Professor Jebb's note is adequate.

While many of the passages mentioned in Section II of this paper can be dismissed as admitting of simple explanations, such as by restoration of the original reading, or those given on Thuc. 3, 36, Herod. 1, 26, of others we can only say that, if the addition of words by an afterthought is not held to be satisfactory, we must take refuge in the fact that the singular is the

generic and the plural is the particular ; but the number of passages that need to be explained thus is very small. And be it noticed, the oft-repeated dictum that the verb comes first has been shown above to be wrong. Enough has been said above of the attraction of a verb to its complement, and the conjunction of *ἔστι* and a plural complement ; and no longer ought we to find in grammars this use of the copulative verb joined to the examples with ordinary verbs, treated above. The connection, too, of the *γίγνεται* examples with this use of *ἔστι* should cease. The few hopeless passages, such as Pindar, Pyth. 4, 57 and [Pindar] Fragments 225, 265 will perhaps never be cleared up ; but in themselves they are slight foundations on which to build in the grammars a paragraph of examples of quasi-false concords of multitudinous forms.

Finally, the name *σχῆμα Πινδαρικόν* should be given up when it is seen that it is unjust to the memory of Pindar, and unsuitable to what comes under the head of many different *σχήματα* ; and grammars should note the extended use of *ῆν* as a plural form, and omitting the doubtful examples, merely refer to the use of *ἐστί* with a plural complement, and the attraction of verbs to agree with complements.

R. S. HAYDON.

DEWSBURY, Yorkshire, England.